SM Participation Project -- No. 808040

Category Agency Planning Area Conservation of Natural Resources Environmental Protection Countywide Date Last Modified Previous PDF Page Number Required Adequate Public Facility January 3, 2004 15-6(03 App)

Relocation Impact

None

EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE (\$000)

				CAI CHOIL			00,				
Cost Element	Total	Thru FY03	Est. FY04	Total 6 Years	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	Beyond 6 Years
Planning, Design											
and Supervision	254	0	14	240	40	40	40	40	40	40	0
Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	. 0	0
Site Improvements											
and Utilities	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Construction	2,637	180	897	1,560	260	260	260	260	260	260	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	2,894	180	914	1,800	300	300	300	300	300	300	
				FUNDING	G SCHEDU	JLE (\$000)					
G.O. Bonds	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Revenue:											
General	800	0	200	600	100	100	100	100	100	100	0
Stormwater Management											
Waiver Fees	2,094	180	714	1,200	200	200	200	200	200	200	0
			ANNU	AL OPERA	TING BUD	GET IMPA	CT (\$000)				
Maintenance				96	19	13	19	13	19	13	0
Net Impact				96	19	13	19	13	19	13	0

DESCRIPTION

This project provides for County participation, with developers, in funding construction of regional stormwater management facilities, including wet and dry ponds and other protective devices. County participation is provided where: such construction would add stormwater controls to previously-established areas, in addition to the developer's immediate projects and/or the overall watershed protection benefits provided are deemed preferable to those that would be feasible with on-site controls. The County provides funds for additional storage capacity and features which go beyond the developer's legal requirements and adds stormwater controls to off-site developments. Adding new stormwater controls in developed areas which lack such controls is required in the County's NPDES Municipal Stormwater Discharge Permit.

JUSTIFICATION

On-site controls are the County's preferred stormwater requirement option. Impacts on wetlands and upland waterway habitats versus additional stormwater protection benefits provided in retrofitting off-site developments are the determining factors in evaluating whether to proceed with alternative shared regional stormwater controls. Potential facility sites are typically first identified during the development review process. The developer is responsible for construction plans and all necessary permits for individual projects.

Specific Data

Where feasible, SM facilities reduce local drainage, flooding, stream channel, and erosion problems, and impact on waterway habitat and water quality caused by urban stormwater runoff. County law currently requires developers to control excess stormwater peak flows up to the two-year storm level and to control onsite water quality impacts of new development. This project provides opportunities to achieve increased levels of protection to County waterways by adding stormwater management to previously unmanaged off-site areas, as well as handling runoff generated from new development sites. An example of this is the Aspen Hill project which was constructed as part of the redevelopment of an office building and parking lot. The pond controls 130 acres of existing off-site development in addition to the 26-acre redevelopment site.

Cost Change

ADDDODDIATION AND

Cost increase is due to the addition of FY09 and FY10 to this on-going project.

STATUS

Ongoing. Currently, the County has entered into 46 agreements with developers to participate in the development of regional SM facilities. As of August 2003, 45 facilities have been completed, and one is under construction.

OTHER

Each participation agreement is structured to provide for reimbursement of a portion of the project cost to the developer upon completion of construction. Significant time and cost savings have occurred from the County entering into participation projects, compared to alternative County actions either to construct a public off-site SM facility or to repair flood, erosion, and water-quality damages in the future.

*Expenditures will continue indefinitely.

COODDINATION

APPROPRIATION AND			COORDINATION	MAP			
EXPENDITURE DATA	4		Department of Permitting Services				
Date First Appropriation	FY80	(\$000)	Natural Resources Conservation Service				
Initial Cost Estimate		2,510	M-NCPPC				
First Cost Estimate			Maryland Department of the Environment	100			
Current Scope	FY05	2,894	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	100) 27 124 850			
Last FY's Cost Estimate		2,362	WSSC	\(\sigma_1\)			
Present Cost Estimate		2,894		229			
Appropriation Request	FY05	300					
Appropriation Request Est.	FY06	300					
Supplemental							
Appropriation Request	FY04	0		23 (355)			
Transfer		0		100			
Cumulative Appropriation		1,094					
Expenditures/				MONTGOMERY			
Encumbrances		546		16 / 1901 / (22) 17 / /			
Unencumbered Balance		548		COUNTY			
Partial Closeout Thru	FY02	1,160		MARYLAND			
New Partial Closeout	FY03	68		· ·			
Total Partial Closeout		1,228	1				